



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/704,804	11/03/2000	Stephane Amarger	1807.0767	4599

5514 7590 08/11/2004

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

JONES, DAVID

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/704,804

Applicant(s)

AMARGER, STEPHANE

Examiner

David L Jones

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-16, and 18-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 and 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11/3/2000 was filed before the mailing date of the first action on the merits on 11/3/2000. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Fig. 1, #16 and #26. Corrected drawing sheets, or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not

accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to because in Figure 4, item S7, but the specification page 16, line 22, mentions item "S6", it is unclear which is correct. Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 8 recites: automatic configuration method according to claim 7 when it is dependent on claim 4. But claim 7, recites: automatic configuration method according to any one of claims 2 to 3. It is unclear which claim it is dependent on.

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 15 is dependent on a method claim, but recites a means.

8. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 16 recites "said orders", but there is no place in claims 14 or 15 that specifically teaches "said orders".

9. Claims 29 and 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims recite a facsimile machine comprising means, but there is no prior claim to a facsimile machine incorporated to within the system as claimed prior.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (US 5,923,013) and further in view of Zuber (US 6,219,155).

Regarding claim 1, Suzuki et al. teaches a method for automatic configuration of a computer peripheral for processing a computer document, said computer document being segmented into a plurality of unitary subparts for processing by said peripheral, said subparts being processed sequentially by said peripheral in a preconfigured order of processing, said method comprising:

acquiring (column 5, lines 14-25) context data relating to a processing context of said computer document, said processing context being defined by the content of said subparts and/or by the operating characteristics of said computer peripheral; this is being done by Suzuki in figure 1, after a print file is sent to the print control system, the job control module 20 finds the job description file 14 of the print job, references the job element list, and identifies one or more job elements required for the execution of the print job. More specifically, the job control module 20 finds the page data 16 required for the execution of the print job. When the page data 16 is found, the image data of each page is found and sent to the printer. At this time, the job control module 20 controls printing according to the print attribute contained in the JDF 14 and the page data 16.

The system control module 74 controls (fig. 12, column 8, lines 11-28) the print control system 72. The input data acceptance module 76 accepts input data and sends it to the input data content determination module 78. The input data content determination module 78 determines the type of input data; that is, it checks if the input is a print job, job description file (JDF), JDF

print instruction file (JPF), or JDF revision instruction file (JRF). To determine the type of input data, the module references the comment at the start of input data. If the comment is Job Description File, the module determines that the input is a job description file; if the comment is JDF Print, the module determines that the input is a JDF print instruction file; if the comment is JDF Revise, the module determines that the input is a JDF revision instruction file. If no such identifier, or a comment is found, the module determines that the input is a print job. The system control module through the determination module is testing the data for a valid predetermined context data.

Suzuki modifies (column 14, lines 56-65) the input file based on the information sent from the user as shown in figure 24, it allows multiple copies of documents to be printed out in any order specified by the user. Suzuki does not explicitly teach that modifying a predetermined file order to best adapt the file order for printing.

Whereas, Zuber teaches (column 15, lines 50-67 and column 16, lines 1-26) a method for modifying a predetermined print order for printing. In figure 12, the process is initiated at the software RIP in a block 350, which is operable to retrieve the initial multi-page document and the RIP the document into separate pages, which pages are separate and distinct and have associated therewith parameters that define the nature of the document as to printing, i.e., whether it is color or black and white, the possible resolution of it, bit depth thereof, etc. The process will then flow to a block 352, wherein the job will be defined as being a virtual job routing job and will be divided into two or more jobs. In the present example, there is a black and white job and a color job. The process will then flow to a virtual job router block 354, which is the parsing operation. The black and white job is routed to a first job block 356 and the color

job is routed to a second job block 358. Both of these jobs are handled by a job manager 360, illustrated by the broken line box. The job manager will route the black and white job to a first virtual engine, represented by a block 362, which has associated therewith four black and white print engines 364. The job manager will route the second job associated with the block 358 to a second virtual engine 366, having associated therewith four color print engines 368. It should be noted that the job manager 360 will essentially perform the operation of the parsing and will ensure that pages that are extracted from the internal page buffer will be routed to the appropriate engine in the appropriate manner and at the appropriate time. After the printing is done the job is brought back together and collated for output in the proper order for each copy of the document. Further, Zuber teaches (column 17, lines 1-21) that the document is divided into subparts depending on the type of printing being done (i.e. individual bitmap pages constituting color, bit resolution, bit depth, etc.), which as discussed above includes pages that are text only (black and white).

Suzuki et al. and Zuber are analogous art because they both are from the same field of endeavor, document printing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the ability of Zuber to modify the predetermined format of a printed document with the system of Suzuki et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the ability to parse a print job into separate pages and sent to different virtual printers depending on whether or not the page has simple black and white, which is printed four times faster, or color pages, which are printed at a much slower rate (column 14, lines 50-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Suzuki with Zuber to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Suzuki teaches (fig. 1, column 5, lines 1-6) that print job is first stored into an internal storage 12. The internal storage contains the JDF 14 for each print job as well as a plurality of items of page data 16. Each item of page data 16 has its own unique page data. The JDF 14 contains a job elements (contents) list and the print attributes such as a print sequence and the number of copies. These print attributes are associated with the whole print job. On the other hand, the page data 16 is associated with the print attribute of each page, the print attribute being composed of image data and the print condition of each page.

As discussed in claim 1, Zuber modifies each print job from its original preconfigured sequence into a sequence that allows the print job to be printed in a faster manner and collated back together after printing.

Regarding claim 3, Suzuki teaches (column 5, lines 7-13) that the print jobs as they come in the JDF includes the job elements list and the print attributes, which are associated with the whole job and the page data that is associated with each page is stored in another file separate from the page image file.

Regarding claim 4, Suzuki teaches (column 5, lines 7-13) that the print jobs as they come in the JDF includes the job elements list and the print attributes, which are associated with the whole job and the page data that is associated with each page is stored in another file separate from the page image file. The type of ordered list is shown in figure 13.

Regarding claim 5, Suzuki teaches (column 5, lines 7-13) that the print jobs as they come in the JDF includes the job elements list and the print attributes, which are associated with

the whole job and the page data that is associated with each page is stored in another file separate from the page image file. The type of ordered list is shown in figure 13. As detailed in column 5, lines 52-65, that each job has a unique JDF that includes a unique ID, and each page includes a unique ID sub indexed under the JDF unique ID.

Regarding claim 7, Suzuki teaches (fig. 1, column 5, lines 1-6) that print job is first stored into an internal storage 12. The internal storage contains the JDF 14 for each print job as well as a plurality of items of page data 16. Each item of page data 16 has its own unique page data. The JDF 14 contains a job elements (contents) list and the print attributes such as a print sequence and the number of copies. These print attributes are associated with the whole print job. On the other hand, the page data 16 is associated with the print attribute of each page, the print attribute being composed of image data and the print condition of each page.

As discussed in claim 1, Zuber modifies each print job from its original preconfigured sequence into a sequence that allows the print job to be printed in a faster manner and collated back together after printing. Further, Zuber teaches (column 17, lines 34-45) specifically that the print job is parsed into individual pages and then sent to a virtual printer depending on the page attributes (i.e. color or black and white). Whereas, as previously discussed that the black and white printer is printing at a 12 ppm and the color printing is at 3 ppm, which is allowing for faster printing to be accomplished separate from the slower color printing.

Regarding claim 8, the claim will be rejected based upon if the claim dependent on claim 3, therefore, Suzuki lists that the individual print jobs are sorted by job and sub-stored by individual pages and Zuber specifically teaches that the job is RIPped prior to being sent to the print engine

for faster printing, which allows for the pages to be printed in a faster manner as disclosed in claim 7.

Regarding claim 9, Suzuki (column 5, lines 14-25) and Zuber teach (column 5, lines 44-59) that all of the print data is brought in to the print managers prior to being analyzed.

Regarding claim 10, Suzuki teaches (column 5, lines 1-25) that the step analyzing the print job including the job elements list (contents) and the page attributes.

Regarding claim 12, Suzuki et al. teaches a method for automatic configuration of a computer peripheral for processing a computer document, said computer document being segmented into a plurality of unitary subparts for processing by said peripheral, said subparts being processed sequentially by said peripheral in a preconfigured order of processing, said method comprising:

acquiring (column 5, lines 14-25) context data relating to a processing context of said computer document, said processing context being defined by the content of said subparts and/or by the operating characteristics of said computer peripheral; this is being done by Suzuki in figure 1, after a print file is sent to the print control system, the job control module 20 finds the job description file 14 of the print job, references the job element list, and identifies one or more job elements required for the execution of the print job. More specifically, the job control module 20 finds the page data 16 required for the execution of the print job. When the page data 16 is found, the image data of each page is found and sent to the printer. At this time, the job control module 20 controls printing according to the print attribute contained in the JDF 14 and the page data 16.

The system control module 74 controls (fig. 12, column 8, lines 11-28) the print control

system 72. The input data acceptance module 76 accepts input data and sends it to the input data content determination module 78. The input data content determination module 78 determines the type of input data; that is, it checks if the input is a print job, job description file (JDF), JDF print instruction file (JPF), or JDF revision instruction file (JRF). To determine the type of input data, the module references the comment at the start of input data. If the comment is Job Description File, the module determines that the input is a job description file; if the comment is JDF Print, the module determines that the input is a JDF print instruction file; if the comment is JDF Revise, the module determines that the input is a JDF revision instruction file. If no such identifier, or a comment is found, the module determines that the input is a print job. The system control module through the determination module is testing the data for a valid predetermined context data.

Suzuki modifies (column 14, lines 56-65) the input file based on the information sent from the user as shown in figure 24, it allows multiple copies of documents to be printed out in any order specified by the user. Suzuki does not explicitly teach that modifying a predetermined file order to best adapt the file order for printing.

Whereas, Zuber teaches (column 15, lines 50-67 and column 16, lines 1-26) a method for modifying a predetermined print order for printing. In figure 12, the process is initiated at the software RIP in a block 350, which is operable to retrieve the initial multi-page document and the RIP the document into separate pages, which pages are separate and distinct and have associated therewith parameters that define the nature of the document as to printing, i.e., whether it is color or black and white, the possible resolution of it, bit depth thereof, etc. The process will then flow to a block 352, wherein the job will be defined as being a virtual job

routing job and will be divided into two or more jobs. In the present example, there is a black and white job and a color job. The process will then flow to a virtual job router block 354, which is the parsing operation. The black and white job is routed to a first job block 356 and the color job is routed to a second job block 358. A job manager 360, illustrated by the broken line box, handles both of these jobs. The job manager will route the black and white job to a first virtual engine, represented by a block 362, which has associated therewith four black and white print engines 364. The job manager will route the second job associated with the block 358 to a second virtual engine 366, having associated therewith four color print engines 368. It should be noted that the job manager 360 will essentially perform the operation of the parsing and will ensure that pages that are extracted from the internal page buffer will be routed to the appropriate engine in the appropriate manner and at the appropriate time. After the printing is done the job is brought back together and collated for output in the proper order for each copy of the document. Further, Zuber teaches (column 17, lines 1-21) that the document is divided into subparts depending on the type of printing being done (i.e. individual bitmap pages constituting color, bit resolution, bit depth, etc.), which as discussed above includes pages that are text only (black and white).

Suzuki et al. and Zuber are analogous art because they both are from the same field of endeavor, document printing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the ability of Zuber to modify the predetermined format of a printed document with the system of Suzuki et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the ability to parse a print job into separate pages and sent to different virtual printers depending on whether or not the page has simple black and white, which is printed four times faster, or color pages, which are printed at a much slower rate (column 14, lines 50-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Suzuki with Zuber to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

Regarding claim 13, Suzuki teaches a print job being divided into a plurality of individual pages and printed depending on page elements and attributes. Whereas, Zuber teaches (column 17, lines 1-21) that the document is divided into subparts depending on the type of printing being done (i.e. individual bitmap pages constituting color, bit resolution, bit depth, etc.), which as discussed above includes pages that are text only (black and white).

Regarding claim 14, Suzuki et al. teaches a method for automatic configuration of a computer peripheral for processing a computer document, said computer document being segmented into a plurality of unitary subparts for processing by said peripheral, said subparts being processed sequentially by said peripheral in a preconfigured order of processing, said method comprising:

means for acquiring (fig. 12, 76, column 5, lines 14-25) context data relating to a processing context of said computer document, said processing context being defined by the content of said subparts and/or by the operating characteristics of said computer peripheral; this is being done by Suzuki in figure 1, after a print file is sent to the print control system, the job control module 20 finds the job description file 14 of the print job, references the job element list, and identifies one or more job elements required for the execution of the print job. More

specifically, the job control module 20 finds the page data 16 required for the execution of the print job. When the page data 16 is found, the image data of each page is found and sent to the printer. At this time, the job control module 20 controls printing according to the print attribute contained in the JDF 14 and the page data 16.

The system control module 74 controls (fig. 12, column 8, lines 11-28) the print control system 72. The input data acceptance module 76 accepts input data and sends it to the input data content determination module 78 (means for testing). The input data content determination module 78 determines the type of input data; that is, it checks if the input is a print job, job description file (JDF), JDF print instruction file (JPF), or JDF revision instruction file (JRF). To determine the type of input data, the module references the comment at the start of input data. If the comment is Job Description File, the module determines that the input is a job description file; if the comment is JDF Print, the module determines that the input is a JDF print instruction file; if the comment is JDF Revise, the module determines that the input is a JDF revision instruction file. If no such identifier, or a comment is found, the module determines that the input is a print job. The system control module through the determination module is testing the data for a valid predetermined context data.

Suzuki modifies (column 14, lines 56-65) the input file based on the information sent from the user as shown in figure 24, it allows multiple copies of documents to be printed out in any order specified by the user. Suzuki does not explicitly teach that modifying a predetermined file order to best adapt the file order for printing.

Whereas, Zuber teaches (column 15, lines 50-67 and column 16, lines 1-26) a means of modifying, fig. 1, 14, a predetermined print order for printing. In figure 12, the process is

initiated at the software RIP in a block 350, which is operable to retrieve the initial multi-page document and the RIP the document into separate pages, which pages are separate and distinct and have associated therewith parameters that define the nature of the document as to printing, i.e., whether it is color or black and white, the possible resolution of it, bit depth thereof, etc. The process will then flow to a block 352, wherein the job will be defined as being a virtual job routing job and will be divided into two or more jobs. In the present example, there is a black and white job and a color job. The process will then flow to a virtual job router block 354, which is the parsing operation. The black and white job is routed to a first job block 356 and the color job is routed to a second job block 358. A job manager 360, illustrated by the broken line box, handles both of these jobs. The job manager will route the black and white job to a first virtual engine, represented by a block 362, which has associated therewith four black and white print engines 364. The job manager will route the second job associated with the block 358 to a second virtual engine 366, having associated therewith four color print engines 368. It should be noted that the job manager 360 will essentially perform the operation of the parsing and will ensure that pages that are extracted from the internal page buffer will be routed to the appropriate engine in the appropriate manner and at the appropriate time. After the printing is done the job is brought back together and collated for output in the proper order for each copy of the document. Further, Zuber teaches (column 17, lines 1-21) that the document is divided into subparts depending on the type of printing being done (i.e. individual bitmap pages constituting color, bit resolution, bit depth, etc.), which as discussed above includes pages that are text only (black and white).

Suzuki et al. and Zuber are analogous art because they both are from the same field of endeavor, document printing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the ability of Zuber to modify the predetermined format of a printed document with the system of Suzuki et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the ability to parse a print job into separate pages and sent to different virtual printers depending on whether or not the page has simple black and white, which is printed four times faster, or color pages, which are printed at a much slower rate (column 14, lines 50-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Suzuki with Zuber to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

Regarding claim 15, is rejected based upon claim 14, Suzuki discloses a means (fig. 12, 78) of analyzing the subparts of the computer document;

Zuber teaches a means (fig. 15, 426, column 21, lines 38-52) of acquiring operating characteristics of said computer peripheral.

Regarding claim 16, Suzuki teaches (column 5, lines 1-25) a means (fig. 2, 12) of temporarily storing document data grouped together, each group being associated with an access item;

means (fig. 1, 12) of temporarily storing document access data associated with grouped data.

Regarding claim 18, Suzuki teaches an internal storage 12 (column 8, lines 7-10) and that the system is implemented on a computer having a computer program, and Zuber teaches a spool 20 and page buffers 24.

Regarding claim 19, Suzuki teaches a printer (fig. 12, 104) and Zuber teaches a printer (fig. 1, 16).

Regarding claim 20, Suzuki and Zuber teach a printer, but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the device could include a multifunction device that includes a facsimile machine.

Regarding claim 21, Suzuki teaches a means (fig. 12, 72) to implement automatic configuration on any one of claims 1 to 3.

Regarding claim 22, Suzuki teaches a means (fig. 12, 72) to implement automatic configuration on any one of claims 14 or 15.

Regarding claim 23, Suzuki teaches a computer network (fig. 12) that includes at least one computer and a peripheral to implement according to claims 14 or 15. Zuber teaches (fig. 1) a plurality of workstations 10, network interface 12, processor (RIP) 14, and a plurality of print engines 16.

Regarding claim 24, Suzuki teaches a computer network (fig. 12) that includes at least one computer and a peripheral to implement according to claims 14 or 15. Zuber teaches (fig. 1) a plurality of workstations 10, network interface 12, processor (RIP) 14, and a plurality of print engines 16.

Regarding claim 25, Suzuki teaches an internal storage 12 (column 8, lines 7-10) and that the system is implemented on a computer having a computer program, and Zuber teaches a

spool 20 and page buffers 24. Further, Suzuki teaches a computer network (fig. 12) that includes at least one computer and a peripheral to implement according to claims 14 or 15. Zuber teaches (fig. 1) a plurality of workstations 10, network interface 12, processor (RIP) 14, and a plurality of print engines 16.

Regarding claim 26, Suzuki teaches an internal storage 12 (column 8, lines 7-10) and that the system is implemented on a computer having a computer program, and Zuber teaches a spool 20 and page buffers 24. Further, Suzuki teaches a computer network (fig. 12) that includes at least one computer and a peripheral to implement according to claims 14 or 15. Zuber teaches (fig. 1) a plurality of workstations 10, network interface 12, processor (RIP) 14, and a plurality of print engines 16.

Regarding claim 27, Suzuki teaches an internal storage 12 (column 8, lines 7-10) and that the system is implemented on a computer having a computer program, further Suzuki teaches that the system can be incorporated within a printing device.

Regarding claim 28, Suzuki teaches an internal storage 12 (column 8, lines 7-10) and that the system is implemented on a computer having a computer program, further Suzuki teaches that the system can be incorporated within a printing device.

Regarding claim 29, Suzuki teaches an internal storage 12 (column 8, lines 7-10) and that the system is implemented on a computer having a computer program, further Suzuki teaches that the system can be incorporated within a printing device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the system can be incorporated within a multifunctional device, which includes a facsimile function.

Regarding claim 30, Suzuki teaches an internal storage 12 (column 8, lines 7-10) and that the system is implemented on a computer having a computer program, further Suzuki teaches that the system can be incorporated within a printing device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the system can be incorporated within a multifunctional device, which includes a facsimile function.

Regarding claim 31, Suzuki teaches an internal storage 12 (column 8, lines 7-10) and that the system is implemented on a computer having a computer program, and Zuber teaches a spool 20 and page buffers 24. Further, Suzuki teaches a computer network (fig. 12) that includes at least one computer and a peripheral to implement according to claims 14 or 15. Zuber teaches (fig. 1) a plurality of workstations 10, network interface 12, processor (RIP) 14, and a plurality of print engines 16.

12. Claims 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. and Zuber as applied to claims 1-5 above, and further in view of Pavlovic et al. (US 5,715,379).

Regarding claim 6, Suzuki teaches changing the format of printing based on the format specified by the user. Whereas, Zuber teaches (column 19, lines 29-52) that after each job is printed it is collated either manually or automatically. Neither specifically details printing the document in a reverse order.

Whereas, Pavlovic teaches (column 9, lines 20-52) that a document be sent to the printer in reverse order for printing, by invoking the stream handles in reverse order and stores the data in reverse and sends the data to the printer for printing in reverse page order.

Suzuki et al., Zuber and Pavlovic et al. are analogous art because they both are from the same field of endeavor, document printing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the ability to print in reverse order of Pavlovic et al. with the system of Zuber and Suzuki et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the ability to print in reverse order, so that document is in the correct order for stapling.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Suzuki et al. and Zuber with Pavlovic to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Allowable Subject Matter

13. Claims 11 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David L Jones whose telephone number is (703) 305-4675. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (7:00am - 3:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (703) 305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David L. Jones



EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600